



[7590-01-P]

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2012-0292]

Biweekly Notice

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

Background

Pursuant to Section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from November 15 to November 28, 2012. The last biweekly notice was published on November 27, 2012 (77 FR 70837).

ADDRESSES: You may access information and comment submissions related to this document, which the NRC possesses and are publicly available, by searching on <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID **NRC-2012-0292**. You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2012-0292**. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-492-3668; e-mail: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

- **Mail comments to:** Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

- **Fax comments to:** RADB at 301-492-3446.

For additional direction on accessing information and submitting comments, see “Accessing Information and Submitting Comments” in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments

A. Accessing Information

Please refer to Docket ID **NRC-2012-0292** when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access information related to this document by any of the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **NRC-2012-0292**.

- **NRC’s Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):** You may access publicly available documents online in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select “[ADAMS Public](#)

[Documents](#)” and then select “[Begin Web-based ADAMS Search](#).” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdresource@nrc.gov. Documents may be viewed in ADAMS by performing a search on the document date and docket number.

- **NRC’s PDR:** You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC’s PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID **NRC-2012-0292** in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information that that you do not want to be publicly disclosed in your comment submission. The NRC will post all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as enter the comment submissions into ADAMS. The NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information that they do not want to be publicly disclosed in their comment submission. Your request should state that the NRC does not routinely edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

**Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating
Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards
Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in section 50.92 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant

Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC's regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be

entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a

significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139; August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at

<http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with the NRC's guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for

and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the agency's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866 672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded

pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Requests for hearing, petitions for leave to intervene, and motions for leave to file new or amended contentions that are filed after the 60-day deadline will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the filing demonstrates good cause by satisfying the following three factors in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1): (i) the information upon which the filing is based was not previously available; (ii) the information upon which the filing is based is materially different from information previously available; and (iii) the filing has been submitted in a timely fashion based on the availability of the subsequent information.

For further details with respect to this license amendment application, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc., Docket No. 50-423, Millstone Power Station, Unit 3,

New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: October 4, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specifications by relocating specific surveillance frequencies to a licensee controlled program with the adoption of Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF)-425, Revision 3, "Relocate Surveillance Frequencies to Licensee Control – Risk-Informed Technical Specification Task Force (RITSTF) Initiative 5b." Additionally, the change would add a new program, the Surveillance Frequency Control Program (SFCP), to TS Section 6, Administrative Controls.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes relocate the specified frequencies for periodic surveillance requirements to licensee control under a new Surveillance Frequency Control Program. Surveillance frequencies are not an initiator to any accident previously evaluated. As a result, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased. The systems and components required by the TSs for which the surveillance frequencies are relocated are still required to be operable, meet the acceptance criteria for the surveillance requirements, and be capable of performing any mitigation function assumed in the accident analysis. As a result, the consequences of any accident previously evaluated are not significantly increased.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

No new or different accidents result from utilizing the proposed changes. The changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. In addition, the changes do not impose any new or different requirements. The changes do not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis. The proposed changes are consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and current plant operating practice.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

Response: No.

The design, operation, testing methods, and acceptance criteria for systems, structures, and components (SSCs), specified in applicable codes and standards (or alternatives approved for use by the NRC) will continue to be met as described in the plant licensing basis (including the final safety analysis report and bases to TS), since these are not affected by changes to the surveillance frequencies. Similarly, there is no impact to safety analysis acceptance criteria as described in the plant licensing basis. To evaluate a change in the relocated surveillance frequency, Dominion will perform a probabilistic risk evaluation using the guidance contained in NRC approved NEI 04-10, Rev. 1, in accordance with the TS SFCP. NEI 04-10, Rev. 1, methodology provides reasonable acceptance guidelines and methods for evaluating the risk increase of proposed changes to surveillance frequencies consistent with Regulatory Guide 1.177.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc.,
120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: George A. Wilson.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-270 and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 2 and 3 (ONS2 and ONS3), Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: October 5, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to authorize a one-time, 19 month extension to the integrated leak rate test (ILRT) of the reactor containment building (also known as the containment). The ILRT is normally performed every 10 years. The upcoming ILRT for ONS2 is currently due by May 29, 2014, and for ONS3 is due by December 21, 2014.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed exemption involves a one-time extension to the current interval for ONS Unit 2 and Unit 3 Type A containment testing. The current test interval of 120 months (10 years) would be extended on a one-time basis to no longer than approximately 139 months from the last Type A test. The proposed extension does not involve either a physical change to the plant or a change in the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled. The containment is designed to provide an essentially leak tight barrier against the uncontrolled release of radioactivity to the environment for postulated accidents. As such, the containment and the testing requirements invoked to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident, and do not involve the prevention or identification of any precursors of an accident. Therefore, this proposed extension does not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

This proposed extension is for the next ONS Unit 2 and Unit 3 Type A containment leak rate test only. The Type B and C containment leak rate tests would continue to be performed at the frequency currently required by the ONS TS [Technical Specification]. As documented in NUREG-1493, Type B and C tests have identified a very large percentage of containment leakage paths and the percentage of containment leakage paths that are detected only by Type A testing is very small. The ONS Unit 2 and Unit 3 Type A test history supports this conclusion.

The integrity of the containment is subject to two types of failure mechanisms that can be categorized as (1) activity based and (2) time based. Activity based failure mechanisms are defined as degradation due to system and/or component modifications or maintenance. Local leak rate test requirements and administrative controls such as configuration management and procedural requirements for system restoration ensure that containment integrity is not degraded by plant modifications or maintenance activities. The design and construction requirements of the containment combined with the containment inspections performed in accordance with ASME [American Society of Mechanical Engineers] Section XI, the Maintenance Rule, and TS requirements serve to provide a high degree of assurance that the containment would not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by a Type A test.

Based on the above, the proposed extension does not significantly increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to the TS involves a one-time extension to the current interval for the ONS Unit 2 and Unit 3 Type A containment test. The containment and the testing requirements to periodically demonstrate the integrity of the containment exist to ensure the plant's ability to mitigate the consequences of an accident do not involve any accident precursors or initiators. The proposed change does not involve a physical change to the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change to the manner in which the plant is operated or controlled.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment to the TS involves a one-time extension to the current interval for the ONS Unit 2 and Unit 3 Type A containment test. This amendment does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system set points, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The specific requirements and conditions of the TS Containment Leak Rate Testing Program exist to ensure that the degree of containment structural integrity and leak-tightness that is considered in the plant safety analysis is maintained. The overall containment leak rate limit specified by TS is maintained.

The proposed change involves only the extension of the interval between Type A containment leak rate tests for ONS Unit 2 and Unit 3. The proposed surveillance interval extension is bounded by the 15 year ILRT Interval currently authorized within NEI [Nuclear Energy Institute] 94-01, Revision 2A. Type B and C containment leak rate tests would continue to be performed at the frequency currently required by TS. Industry experience supports the conclusion that Type B and C testing detects a large percentage of containment leakage paths and that the percentage of containment leakage paths that are detected only by Type A testing is small. The containment inspections performed in accordance with ASME Section XI, TS and the Maintenance Rule serve to provide a high degree of assurance that the containment would not degrade in a manner that is detectable only by Type A testing. The combination of these factors ensures that the margin of safety in the plant safety analysis is maintained. The design, operation, testing methods and acceptance criteria for Type A, B, and C containment leakage tests specified in applicable codes and standards would continue to be met, with the acceptance of this proposed change, since these are not affected by changes to the Type A test interval.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Lara S. Nichols, Associate General Counsel, Duke Energy Corporation, 526 South Church Street - EC07H, Charlotte, NC 28202-1802.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Northern States Power Company – Minnesota, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: September 18, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The amendment proposes to revise Technical Specification (TS) Sections 3.1.6, “Rod Pattern Control,” and 3.3.2.1, “Control Rod Block Instrumentation,” to allow MNGP to reference an optional improved Banked Position Withdrawal Sequence (BPWS) shutdown sequence in the TS Bases. In addition, a footnote is revised in TS Table 3.3.2.1-1, “Control Rod Block Instrumentation,” to allow operators to bypass the rod worth minimizer if conditions for the optional BPWS shutdown process are satisfied. The changes are consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Improved Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler, TSTF-476, Revision 1, “Improved BPWS Control Rod Insertion Process (NEDO-33091).”

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. Consistent with the consolidated line item improvement process (CLIIP), the licensee referenced the no significant hazards consideration published in the *Federal Register* on May 23, 2007 (72 FR 29004), which is provided below:

Criterion 1 – The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated

The proposed changes modify the TS to allow the use of the improved banked position withdrawal sequence (BPWS) during shutdowns if the conditions of NEDO-33091-

A, Revision 2, "Improved BPWS Control Rod Insertion Process," July 2004, have been satisfied. The staff finds that the licensee's justifications to support the specific TS changes are consistent with the approved topical report and TSTF-476, Revision 1. Since the change only involves changes in control rod sequencing, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not significantly increased, if at all. The consequences of an accident after adopting TSTF-476 are no different than the consequences of an accident prior to adopting TSTF-476. Therefore, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not significantly affected by this change. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2 – The Proposed Change Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated

The proposed change will not introduce new failure modes or effects and will not, in the absence of other unrelated failures, lead to an accident whose consequences exceed the consequences of accidents previously evaluated. The control rod drop accident (CRDA) is the design basis accident for the subject TS changes. This change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3 – The Proposed Change Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety

The proposed change, TSTF-476, Revision 1, incorporates the improved BPWS, previously approved in NEDO-33091-A, into the improved TS. The control rod drop accident (CRDA) is the design basis accident for the subject TS changes. In order to

minimize the impact of a CRDA, the BPWS process was developed to minimize control rod reactivity worth for BWR plants. The proposed improved BPWS further simplifies the control rod insertion process, and in order to evaluate it, the staff followed the guidelines of Standard Review Plan Section 15.4.9, and referred to General Design Criterion 28 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50 as its regulatory requirement. The TSTF stated the improved BPWS provides the following benefits: (1) Allows the plant to reach the all-rods-in condition prior to significant reactor cool down, which reduces the potential for re-criticality as the reactor cools down; (2) reduces the potential for an operator reactivity control error by reducing the total number of control rod manipulations; (3) minimizes the need for manual scrams during plant shutdowns, resulting in less wear on control rod drive (CRD) system components and CRD mechanisms; and, (4) eliminates unnecessary control rod manipulations at low power, resulting in less wear on reactor manual control and CRD system components. The addition of procedural requirements and verifications specified in NEDO-33091-A, along with the proper use of the BPWS will prevent a control rod drop accident (CRDA) from occurring while power is below the low power setpoint (LPSP). The net change to the margin of safety is insignificant. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert D. Carlson.

Northern States Power Company – Minnesota, Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County, Minnesota

Date of amendment request: September 18, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The amendment proposes to revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.3, “Diesel Fuel Oil, Lube Oil, and Starting Air,” by relocating the current stored diesel fuel oil and lube oil numerical volume requirements from the TS to the TS Bases so that they may be modified under licensee control. The TS are modified so that the stored diesel fuel oil and lube oil inventory will require that a 7-day supply be available for operation of one emergency diesel generator, and the stored lube oil inventory will also continue to require that a 7-day supply be available for each diesel generator. The changes are consistent with NRC-approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Improved Standard Technical Specifications Change Traveler (TSTF-501), Revision 1, “Relocate Stored Fuel Oil and Lube Oil Volume Values to Licensee Control.”

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change relocates the volume of diesel fuel oil required to support 7-day operation of a[n] emergency diesel generator (EDG), and the volume equivalent to a 6-day supply, to licensee control. The proposed change also relocates the volume of diesel lube oil required to support 7-day operation of each onsite EDG, and the volume [of fuel oil] equivalent to a 6-day supply, to licensee control. The specific volume of fuel oil equivalent to a 7-day and 6-day supply is calculated using the NRC-approved methodology described in Regulatory Guide 1.137, “Fuel-Oil Systems for Standby Diesel Generators,” and ANSI N195-1976, “Fuel Oil Systems for Standby Diesel-Generators.” The specific volume of lube oil equivalent to a 7-day and 6-day supply is based on the diesel

generator manufacturer's consumption values for the run time of the diesel generator. Because the requirement to maintain a 7-day supply of diesel fuel oil and lube oil is not changed and is consistent with the assumptions in the accident analyses, and the actions taken when the volume of fuel oil and lube oil are less than a 6-day supply have not changed, neither the probability nor the consequences of any accident previously evaluated will be affected.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change does not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e., no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The change does not alter assumptions made in the safety analysis but ensures that the diesel generator operates as assumed in the accident analysis. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change relocates the volume of diesel fuel oil required to support 7-day operation of a[n] emergency diesel generator, and the volume equivalent to a 6-day supply, to licensee control. The proposed change also relocates the volume of diesel lube oil required to support 7-day operation of each onsite emergency diesel generator, and the volume equivalent to a 6-day supply, to licensee control. As the bases for the existing limits on diesel fuel oil and lube oil are not changed, no change is made to the accident analysis assumptions and no margin of safety is reduced as part of the change.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Peter M. Glass, Assistant General Counsel, Xcel Energy Services, Inc., 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert D. Carlson.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: August 31, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise Technical Specification (TS) 3.6.6, 3.7.5, 3.8.1, 3.8.9, and TS Example 1.3-3 by eliminating second Completion Times from the TSs. These changes are consistent with NRC-approved Industry/Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF) Traveler TSTF-439-A, Revision 2, "Eliminate Second Completion Times Limiting Time from Discovery of Failure to Meet an LCO." Additionally, the proposed LAR will make an administrative revision to TS 3.6.6 by removing an obsolete note associated with Condition 3.6.6.A.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration (NSHC).

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change proposed by incorporating TSTF-439-A, Revision 2, eliminates certain Completion Times from the Technical Specifications. Completion Times are not an initiator to any accident previously

evaluated. As a result, the probability of an accident previously evaluated is not affected. The consequences of an accident during the revised Completion Time are no different than the consequences of the same accident during the existing Completion Times. As a result, the consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not affected by this change. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of structures, systems, and components (SSCs) from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits.

The proposed change described above does not affect the source term, containment isolation, or radiological release assumptions used in evaluating the radiological consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Further, the proposed change does not increase the types or amounts of radioactive effluent that may be released offsite, nor significantly increase individual or cumulative occupational/public radiation exposures. The proposed change is consistent with the safety analysis assumptions and resultant consequences. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Additionally, the proposed change to delete the note from TS Condition 3.6.6.A is administrative in nature and does not impact the operation, physical configuration, or function of plant SSCs. The proposed change does not impact the initiators or assumptions of analyzed events, nor does the proposed change impact the mitigation of accidents or transient events.

Therefore, this proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not involve a physical alteration of the plant (i.e. no new or different type of equipment will be installed) or a change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed changes do not alter any assumptions made in the safety analysis.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed change to delete the second Completion Time does not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety system settings or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The safety analysis acceptance criteria are not affected by this change. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change to delete the note from TS Condition 3.6.6.A is administrative in nature and does not involve any physical changes to plant SSCs, or the manner in which SSCs are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. The proposed change does not involve a change to any safety limits, limiting safety system settings, limiting conditions of operation, or design parameters for any SSC. The proposed change does not impact any safety analysis assumptions and do not involve a change in initial conditions, system response times, or other parameters affecting any accident analysis. The proposed change will not result in plant operation in a configuration outside of the design basis.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Arthur H. Domby, Troutman Sanders, NationsBank Plaza, Suite 5200, 600 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company Docket Nos.: 52-025 and 52-026, Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Units 3 and 4, Burke County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: October 17, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed change would amend Combined License Nos.: NPF-91 and NPF-92 for Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP) Units 3 and 4 in regard to the Turbine Building structures and layout by: (1) changing the door location on the motor-driven fire pump room in the Turbine Building, (2) clarifying the column line designations for the southwest and southeast walls of the Turbine Building first bay, (3) changing the floor to ceiling heights at three different elevations in the Turbine Building main area, and (4) increasing elevations and wall thickness in certain walls of the Turbine Building first Bay.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to the Turbine Building configuration do not alter the assumed initiators to any analyzed event. Changing the door location does not affect the operation of any systems or equipment inside or outside the Turbine Building that could initiate an analyzed accident. Clarifying the column line designations does not affect the operation of any systems or equipment inside or outside the Turbine Building that could initiate an analyzed accident. The changes in elevation and wall thickness do not affect the operation of any systems or equipment inside or outside the Turbine Building that could initiate an analyzed accident. In preparing this license amendment, it was considered if the changes to the Turbine Building door location, column line designations, wall thickness, and floor elevations would have an adverse impact on the ability of the Turbine Building structure to perform its design function to protect the systems, equipment, and components within this building. It was concluded that there was no adverse impact, because design of this structure, including the redesigned first bay wall heights and thicknesses, will continue to be in accordance with the same codes and standards as stated in the VEGP Units 3 and 4 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). The Turbine Building first bay continues to maintain its seismic Category II rating. Based on the above, the probability of an accident previously evaluated will not be increased by these proposed changes.

The proposed Turbine Building configuration changes will not affect radiological dose consequence analysis. The affected portions of the Turbine Building are unrelated to radiological analyses. Therefore, no accident source term parameter or fission product barrier is impacted by these changes. Structures, systems, and components (SSCs) required for mitigation of analyzed accidents are not affected by these changes, and the function of the Turbine Building to provide weather protection for SSCs inside the building is not adversely affected by these changes. Mitigation of a high energy line break (HELB) in the Turbine Building first bay is not adversely affected by this change, because additional vent area will be added to the south wall of the first bay above the Auxiliary Building roof. This additional vent area will exceed the vent area that is blocked by the change to the Turbine Building main area elevations. Consequently, this activity will not increase the consequences of any analyzed accident, including the main steam line limiting break.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed Turbine Building configuration changes to the location of a door leading to the Motor-Driven Fire Pump room, column line designations, floor elevations in the main area, and wall heights and thicknesses in the first bay do not change the design function of the Turbine Building or any of the systems or equipment in the Turbine Building or in any other Nuclear Island structures. In assessing the proposed changes, it was considered if they would lead to a different type of possible accident than those previously evaluated. The proposed changes do not adversely affect any system design functions or methods of operation. The proposed changes do not introduce any new equipment or components or change the operation of any existing systems or equipment in a manner that would result in a new failure mode, malfunction, or sequence of events that could affect safety-related or nonsafety-related equipment. This activity will not create a new sequence of events that would result in significant fuel cladding failures. With the implementation of these changes to the design of this structure, including the redesigned first bay wall heights and thicknesses, the structure will continue to be in accordance with the same codes and standards as stated in the VEGP Units 3 and 4 UFSAR. The Turbine Building First Bay continues to maintain its seismic Category II rating. Based on the above, it was concluded that the proposed changes would not lead to a different type of possible accident than those previously considered.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The margin of safety for the design of the Turbine Building, including the seismic Category II Turbine Building first bay, is determined by the use of the current codes and standards and adherence to the assumptions used in the analyses of this structure and the events associated with this structure. The relocated door to the motor-driven fire pump room will continue to meet the current 3-hour fire rating requirements. The revised column line designations do not represent a physical plant modification, and have no adverse impact on plant construction or operation. The design of the Turbine Building, including the increased elevations in the main area and the increased height and thickness of the redesigned first bay walls, will continue to be in accordance with the same codes and standards as stated in the UFSAR. The increased elevation of the first bay roof to allow the installation of blow-out panels will provide additional gross vent area for the first bay, which more than compensates for the current vent area that will be blocked by the change in the Turbine Building main area elevations. Consequently, this activity will not adversely affect the first bay's ability to relieve pressure in the event of the limiting main steam line break, and consequently this activity will not reduce the current margin of safety associated with this event to the design pressure limits for Wall 11 of the Nuclear Island and the walls of the first bay. The first bay will continue to maintain a seismic Category II rating. Adhering to the same codes and standards for the Turbine Building structural design and maintaining a seismic Category II rating for the Turbine Building first bay preserves the current structural safety margins.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. M. Stanford Blanton, Balch & Bingham LLP, 1710 Sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, AL 35203-2015.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Lawrence J. Burkhart.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: September 27, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes the applicable Emergency Action Level for North Anna to include a 15-minute threshold for reactor coolant system leaks.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Criterion 1:

Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change affects the North Anna [and Surry Power Station] Emergency Action Levels, but does not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed change does not modify any plant equipment and does not impact any failure modes that could lead to an accident. Additionally, the proposed change has no effect on the consequences of any analyzed accident since the change does not affect any equipment related to accident mitigation. Based on this discussion, the proposed amendment does not increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2:

Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change affects the North Anna [and Surry Power Station] Emergency Action Levels, but does not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. It does not modify any plant equipment and there is no impact on the capability of the existing equipment to perform their intended functions. No system setpoints are being modified. No new failure modes are introduced by the proposed change. The proposed amendment does not introduce any accident initiators or malfunctions that would cause a new or different kind of accident.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3:

Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The change affects the North Anna [and Surry Power Station] Emergency Action Levels, but does not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed change does not affect any of the assumptions used in the accident analysis, nor does it affect any operability requirements for equipment important to plant safety.

Therefore, the proposed change will not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety in operation of the facility as discussed in this license amendment request.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc.,
120 Tredegar Street, RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station,
Units 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: September 27, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes the applicable Emergency Action Level for Surry Power Station (SPS) to include a 15-minute threshold for reactor coolant system leaks.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Criterion 1:

Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change affects the [North Anna and] Surry Power Station Emergency Action Levels, but does not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed change does not modify any plant equipment and does not impact any failure modes that could lead to an accident. Additionally, the proposed change has no effect on the consequences of any analyzed accident since the change does not affect any equipment related to accident mitigation. Based on this discussion, the proposed amendment does not increase the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2:

Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The change affects the [North Anna and] Surry Power Station Emergency Action Levels, but does not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. It does not modify any plant equipment and there is no impact on the capability of the existing equipment to perform their intended functions. No system setpoints are being modified. No new failure modes are introduced by the proposed change. The proposed amendment does not introduce any accident initiators or malfunctions that would cause a new or different kind of accident.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 3:

Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The change affects the [North Anna and] Surry Power Station Emergency Action Levels, but does not alter any of the requirements of the Operating License or the Technical Specifications. The proposed change does not affect any of the assumptions used in the accident analysis, nor does it affect any operability requirements for equipment important to plant safety. Therefore, the proposed change will not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety in operation of the facility as discussed in this license amendment request.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Lillian M. Cuoco, Senior Counsel, Dominion Resources Services, Inc.,
120 Tredegar St., RS-2, Richmond, VA 23219.

NRC Branch Chief: Robert J. Pascarelli.

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station,
Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: October 18, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would revise Paragraph 2.C(5)(a) of the renewed facility operating license and the fire protection program as described in the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR) to allow a deviation from the separation requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.2, as documented in Appendix 9.5E of the Wolf Creek Generating Station USAR, for the volume control tank outlet valves.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR

50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The design function of structures, systems and components (SSCs) are not impacted by the proposed change. An evaluation of not maintaining the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.2, separation requirements for the volume, control tank outlet valves and associated circuits determined that the fire protection features provided in fire area A-8 as well as the low fixed combustible loading provides reasonable assurance that at least one valve will respond to a close signal from the control room following a credible fire in the area. The proposed change does not alter or prevent the ability of SSCs from performing their intended function to mitigate the consequences of an initiating event within the assumed acceptance limits. Therefore, the probability of any accident previously evaluated is not increased. Equipment required to mitigate an accident remains capable of performing the assumed function.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change will not alter the requirements or function for systems required during accident conditions. An evaluation of not maintaining the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.2, separation requirements for the volume control tank outlet valves and associated circuits determined that the fire protection features provided in fire area A-8 as well as the low fixed combustible loading provides reasonable assurance that at least one valve will respond to a close signal from the control room following a credible fire in the area. The design function of structures, systems and components are not impacted by the proposed change.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

There will be no effect on the manner in which safety limits or limiting safety system settings are determined nor will there be any effect on those plant systems necessary to assure the accomplishment of protection functions. There will be no impact on departure from nuclear boiling ratio (DNBR) limits, heat flux hot channel factor ($F_Q(Z)$) limits, nuclear enthalpy rise hot channel factor ($F^N\Delta_H$) limits, peak centerline temperature (PCT) limits, peak local power density or any other margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP., 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Branch Chief: Michael T. Markley.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The

Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

A notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license or combined license, as applicable, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing in connection with these actions, was published in the *Federal Register* as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are

problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendments: June 18, 2012, as supplemented on September 17, 2012.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments approved a change in scope of Cyber Security Plan Implementation Milestone 6, and revise License Condition 4.D, "Physical Protection," of the Renewed Facility Operating Licenses for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2.

Date of issuance: November 23, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented by December 31, 2012.

Amendment Nos.: 247 (Unit 1) and 251 (Unit 2).

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27: Amendments revised the Renewed Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: September 11, 2012 (77 FR 55873).

The licensee's September 17, 2012, supplemental letter contained clarifying information, did not change the scope of the original amendment request, did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration determination, and did not expand the scope of the original *Federal Register* notice.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 23, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendment: April 2, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) by deleting the Steam Generator Water Level Low Coincident with Steam Flow/Feedwater Flow Mismatch Reactor Trip Function from the TS Table 3.3.1-1 Item 15.

Date of issuance: November 20, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented during Fall 2013 refueling outage for Unit 1 and during Spring 2013 refueling outage for Unit 2.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 268 and Unit 2 - 249.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7: Amendments changed the licenses and the technical specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: June 12, 2012 (77 FR 35076).

The supplement dated August 6, 2012, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 20, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Docket No. 50-482, Wolf Creek Generating Station, Coffey County, Kansas

Date of amendment request: April 26, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications (TSs) to adopt NRC-approved Technical Specifications Task Force (TSTF) Change Traveler TSTF-510, Revision 2, "Revision to Steam Generator Program Inspection Frequencies and Tube Sample Selection," using the consolidated line item improvement process (CLIIP). Specifically, the amendment revised TS 3.4.17, "Steam Generator (SG) Tube Integrity," TS 5.5.9, "Steam Generator (SG) Program," and TS 5.6.10, "Steam Generator Tube Inspection Report," and included TS Bases changes that summarize and clarify the purpose of the TS.

Date of issuance: November 19, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 90 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 199.

Renewed Facility Operating License No. NPF-42. The amendment revised the Operating License and Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: September 4, 2012 (77 FR 53931).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated November 19, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of November 2012.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION.

/RA/

Michele G. Evans, Director,
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing,
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 2012-29612 Filed 12/10/2012 at 8:45 am;
Publication Date: 12/11/2012]